United Nations A/HRC/30/NGO/132

General Assembly

Distr.: General
8 September 2015

English only

Human Rights Council
Thirtieth session
Agenda item 3
Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, including the right to development

Written statement* submitted by the Make Mothers Matter - MMM, a non-governmental organization in general consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement which is circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[31 August 2015]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

GE.15-15239(E)

Please recycle

The human right to safe drinking water and unpaid care work

Make Mothers Matter (MMM) extends its appreciation to the Special Rapporteur on Water and Sanitation for the opportunity to discuss his future work, and very much welcomes his plan to focus its 2016 thematic report on gender equality. This major issue definitely needs to be addressed in relation to the right to safe drinking water and sanitation, and in the context of the 2030 agenda.

Indeed, women and girls, particularly those living in rural areas in developing countries, are affected differently than men by the inadequate provision of safe drinking water and sanitation. They from a disproportionate negative impact on several other human rights, notably the right to education, the right to health and the right to decent life and work.

MMM would like to particularly draw the attention on the linkage between the right to water and the issue of unpaid care work, a key obstacle to gender equality.

Research shows that in sub-Saharan Africa, 71 per cent of the burden of collecting water for households falls on women and girls,[1] who in total spend 40 billion hours a year collecting water, i.e. the equivalent to a year's worth of labour by the entire workforce in France![2] Further, it is estimated that African women in rural areas walk on average 6 km a day to fetch water[3].

In effect, States' failure to provide for adequate provision of water is mostly compensated by women and girls' unpaid work, a time burden with significant health impacts that greatly contributes to gender inequality. One can even say that this "unpaid work subsidizes government by provisioning to households"[4].

The lack of access to basic infrastructure and technology (i.e. water and sanitation, but also energy, ICTs and other household technologies) forces women to dedicate a lot of time to fetching water and collecting firewood in addition to performing other domestic tasks and family care work, thus exacerbating women's unpaid care work. In turn, this huge total amount of time that women, most notably mothers, and girls spend on all such unpaid work for their families and their communities prevents them from engaging in income generating activities or education, thus contributing to perpetuate the circle of poverty.

The situation is exacerbated in families and communities affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic where caring for an AIDS patient can increase the workload of a family caregiver by one third, with women performing between 70 and 90 % of this unpaid care work. A rural woman interviewed in Southern Africa estimated that it took 24 buckets of water a day, fetched by hand, to care for a family member who was dying of AIDS - water to wash the clothes, the sheets and the patient[5].

The availability, access to, and use of, critical infrastructure such as water and sanitation can significantly reduce the time burden and drudgery of the unpaid work of fetching water that mostly falls on women and girls. Research in Tanzania has shown that a one-hour reduction for every 10 hours per week spent on water and firewood collection

[1] Millennium Development Goals Report 2012

[2] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Human Development Report 2006: Beyond Scarcity: Power, Poverty and the Global Water Crisis. p. 47

[3] UN fact sheet on the Human Right to water http://www.un.org/waterforlifedecade/human_right_to_water.shtml

[4] Indira Hirway: "Unpaid Work and the Economy: Linkages and Their Implications", Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, May 2015

[5] UNAIDS, UNFPA and UNIFEM 2004 report 'Women and HIV/AIDS: Confronting the Crisis' , cited in UNDP Policy Brief on Unpaid Care Work, October 2009

increased the probability that women would engage in off-farm business activities by 7%[6]. Similarly, a project in rural Morocco, which reduced the time girls spent fetching water, resulted in a 20 per cent increase in girls' school attendance[7].

As part of its mission to support mothers around the world, MMM advocates for the development of such infrastructure that would reduce their workload: working jointly with the UNESCO NGO Liaison Committee, MMM invited one of its member organisations, Aide à la Jeunesse Africaine Défavorisée (AJAD) to participate to the Forum on access to safe water, which was organised in July 2014 in Yamassoukro, Cote d'Ivoire, by UNESCO in collaboration with the government of Cote d'Ivoire. This Forum resulted in the Yamassoukro call for action: "one for all, all for water!", and the creation of a network of NGOs, RONUCI, led by MMM member AJAD and committed to implementing the call for action in Cote d'Ivoire[8].

In conclusion:

- The right to water and sanitation is therefore, not only a basic human right: it is also key to gender equality and women economic empowerment.

- The development of basic public infrastructure and services such as water and sanitation, associated with low cost technology and the development of other key infrastructure such as energy, transportation and ICTs should therefore be a key priority of governments in developing countries, not only for obvious health purposes, but also with the explicit objective of reducing unpaid work and supporting women empowerment. It is also a matter of political will.

- Time-use surveys are necessary to make the unpaid work of collecting water and other unpaid family care work visible, and to monitor the implementation of public infrastructure and services development policies. They should be regularly conducted and the data collected should be disaggregated by sex and age, measuring simultaneous activities, including and differentiating housework, care of persons and firewood/water collection in order to best inform and monitor gender-sensitive policies[9].

---

[6] Seebens H., 2006, 'The Contribution of Female Non-Farm Income to Poverty Reduction', background paper prepared for Ellis, A., M. Blackden, J. Cutura, F. MacCulloch and H. Seebens, 2007, Gender and Economic Growth in Tanzania: Creating Opportunities for Women, Directions in Development series, The World Bank, Washington, D.C. – cited in UNDP Policy Brief on Unpaid Care Work, October 2009

[7] UN Water, Gender, Water and Sanitation: A Policy Brief, 2006.

[8] More information on http://www.makemothersmatter.org/ficdoc/1407_MMM_AJAD_ACCES_EAU.pdf

[9] Esquivel, Sixteen years after Beijing: What are the new policy agenda for time-use data collection? Feminist Economics 17:4 2011, pp.215-238

United Nations A/HRC/30/NGO/133

General Assembly

Distr.: General
8 September 2015

English and French only

Human Rights Council
Thirtieth session
Agenda item 4
Human rights situations that require the Council's attention

Written statement* submitted by the Women's Human Rights International Association, a non-governmental organization in special consultative status

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement which is circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[31 August 2015]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

GE.15-15240(E)

Please recycle

Executions in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the increasing trend in the systematic violation of human rights is a matter of great concern

Violations of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran have continued unabated for three decades. With over 2000 executions since Rouhani assumed office, Irans government ranks first in the world in executions per capita and it executes the greatest number of juveniles.

On July 23, 2015 Amnesty international reported: "*The Iranian authorities are believed to have executed an astonishing 694 people between 1 January and 15 July 2015 . . . This is equivalent to executing more than three people per day. . . . Iran's staggering execution toll for the first half of this year paints a sinister picture of the machinery of the state carrying out premeditated, judiciary-sanctioned killings on a mass scale*"

Iran ranks first in the execution of juveniles. Execution of ethnic and religious minorities has regrettably increased. A number of Christian pastors have been imprisoned for defending their beliefs. Violation of the rights of minorities, women's rights, civil rights and anti-democratic foundations have been inscribed into the constitution and laws of the country.

In summer of 1988, following a fatwa by Khomeini, 30,000 political prisoners, mostly affiliated with the PMOI, whom refused to abandon their political beliefs were massacred. Human rights organizations have described it as a 'crime against humanity'. Those responsible for this massacre, continue to hold key positions in the government. Mostafa Pourmohammadi and Ibrahim Raeisi, two of the members of the death committee created by Khomeini to carry out the massacre are respectively the Minister of Judiciary and Prosecutor General.

On August 5, 2015, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights expressed his concern about the situation of human rights, especially the executions in the Islamic Republic of Iran, and said: "*Iran's use of the death penalty has long been problematic.*" He added: "*I urge the Government of Iran to immediately impose a moratorium on all executions and to work with us and other partners on alternative strategies to combat crime*".

Iranian refugees living abroad are faced with a variety of conspiracies and suppressive measures by the Iranian authorities. Ashraf and Liberty, camps of Iranian refugees in Iraq which in principal are protected under the Fourth Geneva Convention have been faced with numerous attacks in recent years at the behest of the Iranian government and are currently under siege. Since 2009, 117 inhabitants of the camps have been killed through the attacks and 26 people have died due to the medical blockade imposed.

We the signatories of this statement share the concern of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights.

We urge the employment of all legal international instruments to bring to a halt Iran's executions and ask all countries of the United Nations to place the moratorium on executions as a precondition for their relations with the government of Iran.

We call on the UN Security Council to take note of executions in the Islamic Republic of Iran, particularly the execution of political prisoners and other gross violations of human rights, with an aim to transmit the information to the International Criminal Court.

We urge that the basic rights and security of the Iranian refugees in Camp Liberty, Iraq, be guaranteed.

United Nations A/HRC/30/NGO/134

General Assembly

Distr.: General
8 September 2015

English only

Human Rights Council
Thirtieth session
Agenda item 5
Human rights bodies and mechanisms

Written statement* submitted by the Indian Council of South America (CISA), a non-governmental organization on the roster

The Secretary-General has received the following written statement which is circulated in accordance with Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31.

[31 August 2015]

* This written statement is issued, unedited, in the language(s) received from the submitting non-governmental organization(s).

GE.15-15241(E)

Please recycle

Recommendations for EMRIP and UN Plan of Action

The so-called consultation on the United Nations System-wide Action Plan at the 8th session of EMRIP was more an attempt by the representative of the Secretary General to muffle the rights of Indigenous Peoples rather than invoke the universal application of Indigenous rights and place them on the table. Where was the explanation before the consultation by either the Secretariat of EMRIP or by a Special Hand-out by the Facilitator to say that this consultation was a follow-up of the meeting on development in Addis Abba in July? This was an assault on the rights of Indigenous Peoples with an agenda that was narrowed to "achieving the ends of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples". This consultation was based on the High Level Plenary that unilaterally reduced the scope and application of the rights of Indigenous Peoples by a façade of regional representation. The right to self-determination, equal participation and consent were removed from the General Assembly resolution leaving a one way path to State determination on what the scope and application of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and how Indigenous Rights are to be reduced and omitted at the United Nations.

The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is not the only standard from which Indigenous Peoples can harness their rights. There are Indigenous Peoples recognized under the United Nations decolonization process (Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations) and are also subjects of international law. The "constructive ambiguity" in the text of the Indigenous Declaration requires that in interpreting or determining what some of the ambiguous phrases mean, Indigenous Peoples are to be treated as equals. The equal right and self-determination and equal participation of all peoples, under Article 1.2 of the Charter of the United Nations must be applied to Indigenous Peoples. The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties requires that these principles be treated among equals, not among puppets or collaborators that claim to speak on everyone's behalf.

The issue of puppet governments, puppet institutions, collaborators and/or quislings is part of the international vernacular in international law and relations. This terminology must be part of the equation when considering equal participation and decision-making in meeting such as the High Level Plenary masquerading as a World Conference or at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) deliberations for an international treaty in Traditional Knowledge (TK), Traditional Cultural Expressions (TCEs) and Genetic Resources (GRs). The Permanent Forum sent a document to WIPO requesting equal participation for Indigenous Peoples. It was ignored not only by WIPO, but by Indigenous collaborators who refused to honour it. Indigenous collaborators are highly funded by States and lead their constituency without an open and transparent process. This is how the weal provisions of the Nagoya Protocol came about. Now, WIPO uses such examples as the Nagoya Protocol in other international venues to diminish the rights of Indigenous Peoples. This applies not only to WIPO and the Nagoya Protocol, but to lands and territories of Indigenous Peoples. International law accepts that when collaborators of puppet institutions make an agreement with a colonizing State or occupying power, the State made an agreement with itself.

The Nagoya Protocol and the WIPO examples are why the GCG cannot claim to represent Indigenous regions. Their manner of placing themselves in manufactured leadership positions are a contradiction of the right to self-determination and many principles such as free, prior and informed consent. The so-called "regional representation" meetings of Indigenous Peoples cannot claim to represent the whole of the regions but only a position from organizations from the regions. This false and misleading representation is causing damage to Indigenous Peoples rights. States will not address it since it is their collaborators manufacturing consent. Take the example of the adoption of the Nagoya Protocol. States are happy that collaborating Indigenous representatives agreed to accept the limitation of national law under their jurisdiction in the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. Indigenous Peoples objected to this regional representation at the Nagoya Protocol and prior to the High Level Plenary but were denied the proper voice of objection. This violates the "equal right and self-determination" principle under Article 1.2 of the Charter of the United Nations. CISA and other Indigenous Nations and peoples diplomatically protest the application of the Nagoya Protocol and the attempt to undermine our rights. It is necessary to employ a higher standard of consent for states of peoples such

as Indigenous Peoples at international meetings. Thus, those Indigenous organizations cannot claim regional representation or unilaterally reduce the scope and application of the rights of peoples for all Indigenous Peoples. Such collaborators present a sigh of legal and political relief for particular States who impose unilateral and coercive measures to exploit the world's Indigenous Peoples.

The High Level Plenary masquerading as a world conference did not have the attributes of preparatory meetings and Prepcoms between States and Indigenous Peoples to discuss the parameters for such a conference; instead, a particular group of Indigenous groups gave false and misleading information without addressing or issuing caveats about the detrimental effects of allowing a State driven initiative. The lack of free, prior and informed consent or the fully informed consent principle under the United Nations decolonization process has obviously impaired the ability of Indigenous Peoples to determine their own status and to apply equal participation or consent based on their right to self-determination. Without the respect and dignity given to Indigenous Peoples, this simple High Level Plenary of the General Assembly being billed as a World Conference cannot be used to reduce our rights to our territory and resources unilaterally.

This will have an extremely devastating effect on further standard setting for Indigenous Peoples. There are Indigenous Peoples who do not want to use the existing Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as a standard for implementing their right to self-determination as they claim their rights as subjects of international law. The final report on Treaties, Agreements and Constructive Arrangements by the late Professor Miguel Alfonso Martinez confirms this. Many Indigenous Peoples refuse to relinquish the existing obligations expressed in international treaties that States have to Indigenous Peoples. Make this clear, we diplomatically protest that this one sided High Level Plenary masquerading as a World Conference and its effect on the existing obligations to Indigenous Peoples.

States cannot simply wipe their hands of their international responsibilities concerning the equal right and self-determination of peoples. One example of gross negligence is the adoption of a resolution in support of the High Level Plenary by the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI). Prior to its adoption it was not discussed openly. The NCAI resolution was presented by a collaborating individual representing an organization without applying the free, prior and informed consent as part of the process. The Tribal Governments were deprived of debating the pro's and con's or the negative consequences for supporting such an initiative.

There are puppet institutions established in Alaska and Hawaii and in the Great Sioux Nation that violate the free political institutions principle under Article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations. CISA, the Indigenous Peoples and Nations Coalition, Koani Foundation and the Great Sioux Nations graciously thank Pakistan for calling upon the United States of America to respond to a call that Alaska, Hawaii and the Dakotas be allowed to go before the United Nations Decolonization Committee to present our cases. Our cases are as states of peoples who are vested with the right to self-determination under international law. Our rights already stand in violation or our originally recognized status. Many of our peoples on the ground are not fully informed of our status, and even if they are, many are afraid of the backlash of the United States of America for promoting our rights.

States are denying Indigenous Peoples their rights as peoples by using unilateral and coercive measures imposed by the High Level Plenary or by the restricted domestic law application that is reduced solely to the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. We assert our rights under the law of nations and international as peoples.

- The mandate of EMRIP needs to be able to address the rights of peoples as peoples under Article 1.2 of the Charter of the United Nations.
- It must be able to review developments pertaining to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous peoples
- It must be able to give attention to the evolution of international standards concerning indigenous rights.
- It must be able to interact, communicate and send recommendations to other United Nations bodies
- It must be able to initiate its own procedures and studies

- It must be able to address complaints

CISA and the Indigenous Peoples and Nations Coalition therefore asserts our international law rights need to be established before addressing or limiting the mandate of EMRIP solely to the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.